APPROVED - 12/9/14

City of Ecorse, Michigan

Receivership Transition Advisory Board Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, November 18, 2014

Ecorse City Hall

Council Chambers

Albert B. Buday Civic Center

3869 West Jefferson

Ecorse, Michigan 48229-198

Reported by:
Amy Shankleton-Novess (CER 0838)
Modern Court Reporting & Video, LLC
101-A North Lewis Street
Saline, Michigan 48176
(734) 429-9143/nel

1 (Called to order: 9:03 a.m.) 2 MR. KORYZNO: Good morning, it's three minutes after 3 nine, and I'll call the City of Ecorse Receivership Transition Advisory Board meeting for Tuesday, November 18th, 4 5 2014, to order. 6 Mr. Van de Grift, roll call? MR. VAN DE GRIFT: 7 Robert Bovitz? 8 MR. BOVITZ: Here. 9 MR. VAN DE GRIFT: Edward Koryzno? 10 MR. KORYZNO: Here. 11 MR. VAN DE GRIFT: Joyce Parker? 12 MS. PARKER: Here. 13 MR. VAN DE GRIFT: All present. 14 MR. KORYZNO: Thank you. Next item on the agenda is the approval of the agenda. I'll entertain a motion. 15 16 MR. BOVITZ: So moved. 17 MS. PARKER: Support. 18 MR. KORYZNO: Been moved and supported to approve 19 the agenda as printed. Any discussion? Seeing none, all in 20 favor say aye. 21 MR. BOVITZ: Aye. 22 MS. PARKER: Aye, 23 MR. KORYZNO: Aye. Opposed, same sign. The agenda 24 is Approved. Next item is the approval of the October 14,

2014 RTAB meeting minutes. 1 2 MS. PARKER: So moved. 3 MR. BOVITZ: Support. MR. KORYZNO: It's been moved and supported --4 MR. BOVITZ: The motion with the amendments? 5 6 MR. KORYZNO: With the amendments, all right. Does 7 the maker of the motion agree to that? That's fine, mm-hm. 8 MS. PARKER: MR. KORYZNO: Thank you. Any discussion? 10 none, all in favor say aye. 11 MS. PARKER: Aye. 12 MR. BOVITZ: Aye. 13 Aye. Opposed, same sign. MR. KORYZNO: 14 are approved. Next item is old business. The annual evaluation --15 this board has a duty to submit an annual report each year. 16 17 Previously, the board had approved an evaluation questionnaire which was posed to former City Administrator 18 19 George Strand. The transmittal letter and report before us 20 today is the final report, and while Treasury assisted in the evaluation process, I note that the evaluation is ultimately 21

a communication from the Ecorse Receivership Transition

Advisory Board to the Governor. And as such, because this is

the board's evaluation, I suggest to my fellow board members

that we review both the evaluation and the transmittal letter

22

23

24

1 before us today here at the meeting, and then we can vote.

2.0

2 | And if you are in agreement with that? All right, thank you.

Page one of the evaluation is merely the criteria, so there won't be any -- if there are any changes, it wouldn't be before us today.

So we'll move on to page two, which is section one, the annual performance indicators.

Do the board members have any changes or additional comments to page two? Seeing none, move to page three of annual performance indicators.

Any changes? Seeing none, we'll move to page four of the annual performance indicators.

I have one, under achievement of identified goals -"Has the local governing body identified and adopted any
specific goals that it can pursue?" In the optional

Soyce
comments, it states that Lan Parker oversaw the adoption of a
strategic plan, however, the city officials could not locate
it. It's my understanding that that report has since been
located, so I would recommend that that be amended.

MR. BOVITZ: I'm okay with that.

MS. PARKER: I am, too.

MR. KORYZNO: All right, thank you.

Any other changes on page four?

Moving onto page five of the annual performance indicators, any changes? I'll take this opportunity to read

the general observations comments regarding annual 1 2 performance indicators. "The city has been unable to make operational and 3 financial progress in a comprehensive manner." 4 And then the recommended actions: 5 "City officials need to implement cost savings regarding pension multiplier and copay reductions. City officials need to adhere to adopted budget." 8 All right, page six is blank in my copy; Mr. Van de 9 Grift, we'll need to delete that page. 10 It's about the RTAB, about the city 11 MR. BOVITZ: 12 infrastructure equipment failures, and the answer was yes, the city is currently taking action --13 MR. KORYZNO: Okay, so mine must not have printed 14 15 properly. MR. VAN DE GRIFT: Mine, either. 16 17 MR. BOVITZ: Yeah, but it is checking out in the comments, where the city is currently taking action to make 18 improvements on a sewage system, system, and the City Hall, 19 20 as well other capital improvements, so, I think that's the 21 case, though. All right. Okay. Good, thank you. 22 MR. KORYZNO: Page seven is section two, state oversight. 23 Any changes? Seeing none, move onto page eight of state 24

25

oversight. Any changes?

Again, I'll read the general observations regarding 1 annual performance indicators: 2 "Turnover in City Administrator position has 3 resulted in operational dysfunction. Recommended action 4 for this section, city officials need to hire a qualified 5 permanent City Administrator." 6 Moving onto section three, on page nine, best 7 practices; any changes for page nine? 8 Seeing none, we'll move to page ten of best 9 practices, any changes? 10 Seeing none, we'll move to page 11 of best 11 practices; any changes from the board? 12 Seeing none, we'll move to page 12 of best 13 practices. Any changes from board members? 14 Seeing none, I'll read the general observations. 15 "Lack of a human resource director has created 16 Recommended actions, city officials need to 17 problems. implement policies and procedures regarding risk 18 management. City officials need to evaluate service 19 sharing opportunities and pursue them if economically 20 feasible. City officials need to participate in a goal 21 setting exercise and adopt the resulting goals." 22 . Page 13 is section four, the last section, future 23

Seeing none, we'll move to page 14. Any changes

planning. Any changes from the board for page 13?

24

from the board?

1.8

Seeing none, I'll read the general observations for this section of future planning.

"Five year budget adoption process has been inadequate; recommended actions, city officials need to adhere to the city's strategic plan. City officials need to adopt a realistic five year budget."

And then the final recommendations for the overall evaluation are:

"The city needs to hire a qualified permanent City Administrator, who can work cooperatively with the mayor and City Council, to finalize the significant issues the city faces, and develop action plans to address the city's organizational and financial challenges."

Any others?

MR. BOVITZ: No.

MR. KORYZNO: All right, thank you. Now I will read the transmittal letter that will accompany the evaluation from the board.

"Governor Snyder: On May 1st, 2013, you appointed a Receivership Transition Advisory Board, RTAB, to serve upon the conclusion of Joyce Parker's term as Emergency Manager. This appointment also created a duty for the Board to conduct a formal evaluation of the City's operational and financial progress, noting benchmarks

achieved and not yet achieved, including a list of specific recommendations, and potential resources available to the City. This report details information compiled during this evaluation process.

2.0

2.4

Background - As directed in your appointment letter, the Board is fulfilling the responsibilities outlined in the terms of E.M. Order 94. This is being accomplished by the City preparing and submitting for the monthly RTAB meetings a packet containing City Council minutes, requested agenda items, as well as supporting documentation for these agenda items. All City Council resolutions are subject to approval by the Board, which has involved the Board in all municipal matters that the City Council acts upon.

Structure of Evaluation - In consultation with the Board members, Treasury staff has developed evaluation criteria designed to gauge certain performance indicators, the degree of continued State oversight, the implementation of best practices, and the City's involvement in future planning. Treasury staff met with then City Administrator George Strand, and Contract Controller Tim McCurley on July 8, 2014, and administered the evaluation questionnaire.

Summary of Findings/Financial Performance and
Outlook During the first year of RTAB appointment, the

City of Ecorse has provided adequate levels of service to its residents. This has been evidenced by the rarity of citizen complaints during public comment portions of Board meetings. Additionally, the City has largely complied with principle EM orders, though exceptions exist and are noted in the Compliance with Final Emergency Manager Order section of the attached evaluation questionnaire. Also, the City has operated with a substantial budget surplus, outperforming year one of EM Parker's two year budget. While audit adjustments are still being made, which may increase expenditures, to finalize FY 2013/14, preliminary figures show revenues and expenditures as follows.

Fiscal year 2013/14 revenues, \$10,475,054, which is the original EM budget for the general fund.

Budget with amendments, general fund, \$10,748,054.

Preliminary actual unaudited general fund,
\$11,171,359.

Expenditures for the original EM budget, \$9,079,797. Budget with amendments, \$10,275,337.

Preliminary actual unaudited general fund is \$9,541,684.

The surplus contemplated in the original EM budget for the general fund, was \$877,817. The budgeted -- with amendments, general fund budgeted with amendments, was

anticipated to be \$472,717. The preliminary actual unaudited general fund figures reveals a \$1,647,198.

Despite this accomplishment, significant concerns exist surrounding the financial future of the City. A repeating annual payment of \$1,000,000 to the City, resulting from a tax settlement from the City's largest corporate citizen, has ceased. During the past fiscal year, the City spent 28.4 percent of its budget on pension and OPEB contributions. This percentage will rise, as the City has recently been notified that its annual required payment to MERS is increasing. The Contract Controller has stated, absent favorable changes, the City is projected to deviate from the 2014/15 year of EM Parker's mandated budget.

During this current period of review, the Board has requested a five year budget from the City, in accord with EM Order 94. The City did generate this multi-year budget, and it showed alarming annual deficits, beginning in FY 2015/16, which then were calculated to exhaust general fund balance during fiscal year 2016/17. Upon receipt of this projected insolvency, the Board directed the City to submit a balanced five year budget. Twice the City has resubmitted the five year budget and twice the Board has rejected it; the first time because it effectively eliminated the fire department, and the

2.2

second time because of unrealistic revenue increases. At the time of this review, no progress has been made toward an acceptable five year budget, largely because of the absence of a qualified City Administrator and lack of a financial vision or plan offered by elected city officials.

1.5

Summary of Findings-Operational Competencies — the City of Ecorse suffers due to a lack of continuity in its operational leadership. Since the appointment of the RTAB, the City Council has hired four different City Administrators. This fact alone has caused disruption in the administration of the City, as no administrator has been retained long enough to complete any projects that they initiated. Because the City Administrator is the primary contact to the RTAB according to EM Order 94, turnover in the office of the City Administrator has caused disruptions in information and communication to the Board. The City's greatest need is a qualified, dedicated, and professional City Administrator.

The City Council has taken several actions inconsistent with an understanding of the financial challenges to the City. During the City Council meetings immediately following the release of the initial five year budget showing a financial decline to insolvency, the City Council saw fit to reject a \$327,150 CGAP grant

for jail and dispatch consolidation. By the City's own calculations, this consolidation effort would have saved the City an additional \$775,000 over the next five years. The Board publically rebuked the City for this action and asked the City Council to reconsider before the CGAP deadline. This time, the City Council resolved to reject the grant by a greater majority. The time to accept this grant has now expired.

1.7

There are other indicators of disorganization. The Board recently learned that the City has simply not implemented a reduced pension multiplier or increased refire copays, despite being awarded these cost saving measures during a previous arbitration. Personality conflicts within City government have increased.

Conclusion -- currently, the City of Ecorse is solvent. However, the financial future of the City is uncertain. As of this writing, the report does not have an RTAB approved City Administrator. Unless the City is able to appreciate and respond to the projected future shortfalls, the City will again find itself unable to honor all of its liabilities. This Board is committed to assist the City, however if the projected financials become a reality, a greater degree of State intervention may be required.

Sincerely, the Ecorse Receivership Transition

,	
1	Advisory Board."
2	Any corrections to the letter, from the Board
3	members?
4	MR. BOVITZ: No.
5	MR. KORYZNO: Seeing none, I'll entertain a motion.
6	MR. BOVITZ: So moved.
7	MS. PARKER: Support.
8	MR. KORYZNO: Been moved and supported to approve
9	the annual the annual evaluation, and submit it to
10	Governor Snyder. Any further discussion?
11	MR. BOVITZ: No.
12	MR. KORYZNO: Seeing none, all in favor of the
13	motion say aye.
14	MR. BOVITZ: Aye.
15	MS. PARKER: Aye.
16	MR. KORYZNO: Aye. Opposed, same sign. The motion
17	is approved.
18	Item three, new business. Approval of resolutions
19	and ordinances for City Council meetings.
20	Item one, resolutions from the regular City Council
21	meeting of September 30, 2014. I'll entertain a motion to
22	approve the resolutions from the September 30, 2014 City
23	Council meeting with the exception of Resolution 356.14,
24	budget amendment, purchases for DPW, and Resolution 357.14,

budget amendment, purchases -- purchase of body cameras.

Τ.	MR. BOVIII. BO MOVEG.
2	MS. PARKER: So moved.
3	MR. BOVITZ: Support.
4	MR. KORYZNO: Been moved and supported. Mr. Van de
5	Grift, could you summarize I'm sorry, never mind. Any
6	further discussion on the motion?
7	MS. PARKER: I did have a quick question on the
8	minutes. There was a reference to granting permission to
9	Pyramid Network, and I just wondered if someone could clarify
10	what that's all about?
11	MS. BOOMS: I'm sorry, could you give me the number
12	35814? #358, 14
13	MS. PARKER: Yes.
14	MS. BOOMS: I am unable to provide any
15	clarification. If you have a specific question, I can find
16	out, or, get back to the Board.
17	MS. PARKER: I just wondered what the impact of the
18	approval mean to the City, since it's at a baseball diamond?
19	AUDIENCE MEMBER: I think I know. Pyramid Network
20	is part of 911
21	MR. KORYZNO: For the record I'm sorry, for the
22	record, could you state your name, please?
23	MS. CAPRA: Terri Capra, Community Development.
24	MR. KORYZNO: Thank you.
25	MS. CAPRA: Pyramid Network contacted us, in

partnership with DCC for the 911 tower to go over by the ball
field. It was reviewed by our planner, McKenna, and I
believe Mr. Wycoff has been involved in the discussions. So.
MS. PARKER: Okay.
MS. BOOMS: Is the question will the baseball
diamonds be kept intact?
MS. PARKER: Right, if it's going to impact the use
of the base?
MS. CAPRA: As far as I know, it's still going to be
kept intact.
MS. PARKER: Okay. And then, since you're here, one
other question related to the changes in the zoning
ordinance? I just wondered if there were changes that was
prepared internally by the staff, or did you use a
consultant?
MS. CAPRA: McKenna.
MS. PARKER: Okay.
MS. BOOMS: And this would be the rezoning
ordinance, correct?
MS. CAPRA: Right.
MS. BOOMS: That was prepared by the legal
department; I actually prepared it with McKenna. It's some
rezoning issues for the O'Brien Supermarket.
MS. PARKER: Okay.
MS. BOOMS: It's gone through planning, and zoning,

1 and, there --MS. PARKER: So it's just a matter of making the 2 3 changes? MS. BOOMS: -- and zoning agreements. 4 MS. PARKER: Okay. Thank you. That's all I have. 5 MR. KORYZNO: All right. Any other questions? 6 Seeing none, all in favor of the motion, say aye. 7 MR. BOVITZ: 8 Aye. 9 MS. PARKER: Aye. MR. KORYZNO: Aye. Opposed, same sign. Motion is 10 11 approved. Now, Resolution 356.14. Mr. Van de Grift, could you 12 please summarize this matter for us? 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. VAN DE GRIFT: Yes. Ecorse Department of Public Works Director Lawrence has requested this amendment. It contains \$49,700 in increased expenditures for the Department of Public Works, as well as \$4,800 in increased expenditures for the major street fund. Notably, both increases are to paid entirely out of fund balance.

Inquiry into this matter shows that without this amendment, the DPW is at about 54 percent of its budget, including all invoices. With the amendment, the DPW is still at 48 percent of its budget, with all invoices. Also, Treasury has concerns with a significant amount of overtime consumed by the department, \$10,000 of which is included in

this amendment. Treasury reviews amendment requests which consume fund balance with caution, because they're without a corresponding revenue increase or expenditure reduction to offset it.

time, I believe.

MR. KORYZNO: Any questions for Mr. Van de Grift?

MS. PARKER: I have a question, just in general
about the budget amendments, Mr. Chair. So should I wait
until we get through all three of the amendments, or --?

MR. KORYZNO: No, no, this would be an appropriate

MS. PARKER: Okay. I guess the one question I have is in reference to the overall review of the City's budget, maybe midterm, because we're close to the middle of the year, and whether that's taken place or not? And as part of that mid-year review, if there are other resources within the approved budget that could be transferred to support some of these items, if we need to do them?

MR. KORYZNO: That sounds like a reasonable proposal.

MS. PARKER: Right, that's generally, that's what

you do, and there may be some opportunities, for example,

there was a reference related to the body armor, and how it

might impact the City Attorney's budget. So, if there was a

budget review process, mid-year, you can determine whether

there are situations where some departments are coming under

budget; others are coming over budget, and we can deal with

it more comprehensively.

2.2

MR. KORYZNO: Mr. O'Neal?

MR. O'NEAL: Thank you, Mr. --

MR. KORYZNO: For the record?

MR. O'NEAL: Wayne O'Neal; I'm not quite hired yet. I think that it's incumbent upon myself as a new person coming in, or any City Administrator, as Joyce said, a midyear budget adjustment. Take that with a strategic plan and goal setting, and put all those three together. And I would further request that when I do that, that either Mr. Van de Grift or Mr. Byrne attend the meetings, to talk about your transmittal to the Governor, and the role of the City Administrator, roll all that into one package so that we can head off some of the items that you have in your letter, and do all those at once. I think that would be incumbent upon us.

MS. PARKER: And there's the other comment, is, given the fact that there is an interim City Administrator in place, perhaps that type of review could take place before these items are considered by the RTAB.

MR. O'NEAL: And that's what they should be, because I was involved with some of the budget process beforehand, and have a familiarity with the budget. And I think you're right, I think we need to look at the whole thing as a package. Thank you.

Thank you. 1 MR. KORYZNO: Any other questions regarding this budget amendment? 2 If not, I'll entertain a motion. 3 MS. PARKER: I would move to table the item. 4 5 MR. BOVITZ: Support. MR. KORYZNO: Been moved and supported to table the 6 Any further discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of 7 8 the motion say aye. MR. BOVITZ: Ave. 9 MS. PARKER: 10 Aye. MR. KORYZNO: Aye. Opposed same sign. 11 Next item is The Resolution 356.14 has been tabled. 12 Resolution 357.14, Mr. Van de Grift? 13 MR. VAN DE GRIFT: This amendment requests sums to 14 some \$70,000 for body cameras for the Ecorse Police 15 Department. The intent of these body cameras is, I believe, 16 to reduce the number and cost of civil claims against the 17 City, relating to Ecorse Police operations. The request for 18 body cameras has been made by Public Safety Director Moore, 19 and is supported by Counselor Wycoff. 20 I also note that because there is not a 2.1 corresponding revenue increase or expenditure reduction, fund 22 balances for those is the sole funding source for this 2.3

Thank you. Any questions for Mr. Van

24

25

amendment.

MR. KORYZNO:

de Grift? 1 MS. PARKER: Not for Mr. Van de Grift, but again, I 3 think if we could get that overall review it would help? 4 MR. KORYZNO: Sure. And, certainly, the use of fund balance 5 MS. PARKER: 6 should be your very last resort. 7 MR. KORYZNO: Absolutely. I'll entertain a motion, 8 then. 9 MS. PARKER: I would move to table the item. 10 MR. BOVITZ: Support. 11 MR. KORYZNO: Been moved and supported to table 12 Resolution 357.14; any further discussion? 13 If I may? MR. MOORE: 14 MR. KORYZNO: Yes, Public Safety Director Moore? 15 MR. MOORE: Mike Moore, Public Safety Director. One thing I would like to throw out here; I'm also dragging my 16 17 feet on this issue. There's been legislation introduced to 18 try to make this mandatory. And from what I'm hearing, it's 19 just been introduced, now, and there may be grant dollars out 20 there if this is something that they pass, to make this 21 mandatory with all departments. 22 So as I said, I've been dragging my feet with this. 23 I've got one company -- actually, I've got three companies.

The first company already sent us a demo that we use, and

they're going to send us another one out this week.

24

got another company that's supposed to come out and give us a whole dog and pony show with one of their units, because there's three major companies that handle these units.

But as I said before, they're going to, from what I'm hearing, this eventually is going to be mandated. So, because of this being mandated, there are going to probably be grant dollars available for this.

MS. PARKER: So would it be advisable to maybe wait to see if we get the grant funding?

MR. MOORE: Now, this is the thing that we're going to have to come up with. We're going to have to talk with Mr. O'Neal about, reference the waiting. You know, me -- since I've been here we've had no lawsuits, we've had none.

MR. BOVITZ: Well the fact that we're tabling it effectively, puts it --

MR. MOORE: Well, I just wanted you to know this, because it is really informational only. Last year and a half, we've had zero. With all the lawsuits on the table now, that we're discussing, that we're doing all this research on, we've got about five or six. And all of them are dating -- pre dating me, they go on back to 2012, and things. And all of them are to do with tasers.

And if we had -- originally, we started thinking about cameras on the tasers. But the ones that are coming out now, the body cameras, I've even got one company where

you can take the camera off your body and mount it in the car. And they've got equipment in the trunks, where you can just take it off, mount it on a car and all that, it goes to the car. But then, bring it in, sit it, and it goes up to the cloud. The technology has kind of advanced.

MR. BOVITZ: I think we're all in agreement that we want the body cameras; it's just the best thing to do now is to table it, and then wait and then see if we get the grants.

MR. MOORE: Well, there's, like I say, it's informational only; this thing is coming down the pike where it's going be mandated, so there may be grant dollars out of this.

MS. PARKER: Now, one other question, since you're at the podium. With the issue of tasers and lawsuits being filed, have we, the City, put in place training to resolve those issues?

MR. MOORE: Very good question. We've -- I've got Corporal Barkman in a temporary special assignment with his task force, and the leader of the task force is coming in now. He's a trainer. And then I put Corporal Barkman along with Sergeant Howard into a train the trainer program, to where we can get in-house training on this.

But Jim McMahon, out of Highland Park, is coming in and we've set up where he's going to train everybody and we have people that are not certified, that are going to get

certified. And we're going to certify everybody, even those that do not carry tasers. They are going to be certified, too. So we've got that already in the works.

MR. KORYZNO: Does the department have policies regarding the use of tasers?

MR. MOORE: Yes, we do.

MR. KORYZNO: And are those strictly adhered to?

enforced

MR. MOORE: Absolutely. And they've been in forced

since the tasers have been here.

MR. KORYZNO: Thank you.

MS. PARKER: So basically, you're saying the cases that you've had beforehand are older cases, prior to your involvement?

MR. MOORE: Every case that we've been sued that are in litigation right now, they're dating back to 2009, 2012; they're all prior, they pre-date me. They -- we haven't had a lawsuit, well, since I've been here, I can't remember the last one. But all the ones that are in litigation now have to do with tasers, mainly, and I think there's about five of them that we're dealing with now.

All have to do with tasers, and they're going back to 2009, 2012. But going back to what originally we started talking about tasers, the cameras on the tasers. They said well, Mr. Wycoff brought it up, said, we have tasers, they have tasers out now with cameras in them. So if we had this,

this would eliminate a lot of things. We would have video 1 available, but as an aside if you get regular body cameras, 2 this would cover everything. 3 But my reason for standing here now is that this 4 5 legislation is coming out, and there may be grant dollars available. That's all I wanted. 6 MR. KORYZNO: Thank you. It's been moved and 7 supported to table Resolution 357.14. Seeing no further 8 discussion, all in favor of the motion say aye. 9 MR. BOVITZ: Aye. 10 11 MS. PARKER: Aye. MR. KORYZNO: Aye. Opposed same sign; Resolution 12 357.14 is tabled. 13 Item number two under new business is resolutions 14 from regular City Council meeting of October 14, 2014. 15 Entertain a motion to approve the resolutions from October 16 14, 2014, with the exception of Resolution 372.14, Master 17 Plan funding. 18 19 MR. BOVITZ: So moved. 20 MS. PARKER: Support. MR. KORYZNO: Been moved and supported; any further 21 Seeing none, all in favor of the motion say aye. 22 discussion? 23 MR. BOVITZ: Aye. MS. PARKER: Aye. 24 MR. KORYZNO: Aye. Opposed same sign. Resolutions

1 from the October 14th meeting have been approved, with the 2 exception of Resolution 372.14. Resolution 372.14, Mr. Van de Grift? 3 MR. VAN DE GRIFT: 4 This amendment recognizes an 5 \$11,000, \$11,380 grant from the Michigan Economic Development 6 Corporation that the City has secured to fund the Master 7 The City intends to also use \$5,120 of fund balance 8 for this project. Because of the MEDC grant, and because of 9 the advantages of having a well-developed Master Plan, 10 Treasury staff does feel that this amendment may be in the 11 City's best interest. 1.2 MR. KORYZNO: Any questions for Mr. Van de Grift? 13 MS. PARKER: No, but I again, would suggest that we 14 hold off if we can get that overall review completed, because 15 there may be other funding that could be used for that 16 purpose. 17 MR. KORYZNO: That's certainly acceptable. Having said that, I'll entertain a motion. 18 19 MS. PARKER: So I would move to table the item. 20 MR. BOVITZ: Support. 21 MR. KORYZNO: Been moved and supported to table 22 Resolution 372.14; any further discussion? Seeing none, all 23 in favor of the motion say aye. 24 MR. BOVITZ: Aye. 25 MS. PARKER: Aye.

MR. KORYZNO: Aye. Opposed, same sign. Resolution 1 372.14 is tabled. 2 Item three, resolutions from work study session of 3 October 23rd, 2014. I'll entertain a motion to approve the 4 resolutions from the work study session. 5 MS. PARKER: So moved. 6 MR. BOVITZ: Support. 7 MR. KORYZNO: Been moved and supported to approve 8 the resolutions. Any discussion? Seeing none, all in favor 9 of the motion say aye. 10 MR. BOVITZ: Aye. 11 MS. PARKER: Aye. 12 MR. KORYZNO: Aye. Opposed, same sign. Resolutions 13 approving the work study session of October 23rd, 2014 are 14 Item four, claims and accounts from regular 15 approved. City Council meeting draft minutes of October 28th, 2014. 16 MR. BOVITZ: Move to approve the claims and accounts 17 of the City Council meeting draft minutes, October 28th, 18 2014. 19 MS. PARKER: Support. 20 MR. KORYZNO: Been moved and supported; any further 21 discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of the motion say aye. 22 MR. BOVITZ: Aye. 23 MS. PARKER: Aye. 24 MR. KORYZNO: Aye. Opposed, same sign. Claims and 25

accounts for October 28th, 2014, are approved.

Item three -- 2B, letter from city administration, dated November 7, 2014. Item B1, approval of City Council meeting minutes have been addressed. Item B2, approval of budget to actual report. Mr. McCurley?

MR. McCURLEY: Good morning, Tim McCurley, contracted controller.

MS. PARKER: Good morning.

MR. KORYZNO: Anything significant to share with the Board regarding the budget to actual report?

MR. McCURLEY: For the most part, no. The revenues are looking very good, expenditures for the most part are in line. We will have to do some budget amendments, due to what we've talked about for the MERS. Will have to be addressed, because when the two year budget that was put together by the Emergency Financial Manager, at that point in time, we didn't have those numbers. Those numbers have since increased, so those numbers will have to be amended at some point in time. And with Mr. O'Neal, I'm sure we're going to be working on doing those type of amendments and reviewing the five year along with that.

There is one department that is a concern of mine at this point in time, and that is the Department of Public Works, sorry. And as the budget amendment that Mr. Van de Grift had indicated, they're currently at 48 percent, with

invoices that have not been paid but have been held for various reasons. But if that continues on without some stoppage, without some plan, that department will be over budget before June 30th.

My projection will be March, April, and as we all know, we are not supposed to spend money without it being budgeted, it's a violation of the Uniform Budgeting Act, so, that is a major concern this city has. Other than that, no, sir.

MR. KORYZNO: All right, thank you. Any questions from the Board members for Mr. McCurley?

MS. PARKER: Just a comment. Just in reference to Public Works and the operation of the department and the oversight related to the budget. You know, I would ask that the interim City Administrator take a good look at the budget, the operation, whether it's consistent with what was in place when the original budget was established. Because a lot of services related to public works, to a great extent, was really outsourced.

So if, in fact, there has been a different philosophy in terms of how the department operates, it's going to impact the budget. So I think someone needs to take a look at that, and also the administration of the department.

MR. McCURLEY: With that, it's not just the

Department of Public Works in a general point; it's also the 1 water and sewer budget, that's inter-related, that needs to 2 3 have the whole picture looked at. MS. PARKER: To be reviewed. 4 5 MR. McCURLEY: Yes. MR. BOVITZ: And with the flooding, I think some of 6 7 the expenditures may actually be reimbursed when the 8 reimbursement requests come in. 9 MS. PARKER: Right. 10 MR. McCURLEY: That's what I've been told, but, 11 until we get the money, I'm hesitant on some of that. 12 MS. PARKER: Have you received any written notification that the city will receive funding through FEMA, 13 14 or from another agency? MR. McCURLEY: I have not been involved with that 1.5 16 process. 17 MS. CAPRA: I have. Me again, Terri Capra, 18 Community Development. 19 MR. KORYZNO: Thank you. 20 MS. CAPRA: We have been meeting with FEMA 21 representative, his name is Nate Berkey. We're gathering 22 information to get reimbursed for the DPW for some work that 23 they had to do for the flooding. Also trying to get reimbursed for the garbage, when we brought in extra trucks 2.4

to relieve the stuff, so we're just working on putting

25

remove-

paperwork together.

We have five categories that we're seeking reimbursement in. DPW, garbage, the Pennsylvania Club roof, this roof, and hopefully with Wayne back, he can be part of the discussions, and. So we're just waiting to get him some paperwork; hopefully have another meeting scheduled this week or next week.

MS. PARKER: So, Terri, did they give you any indication of whether reimbursement will take place this fiscal year?

MS. CAPRA: Yeah. They're trying to get them done as soon as possible.

MS. PARKER: So once you get the paperwork in?

MS. CAPRA: Right.

MS. PARKER: Okay.

MS. CAPRA: And we do not have to wait until we have the paperwork on all five. If we got one category done, we can turn it in and get it processed. We're waiting on some estimates for the roofs.

MS. PARKER: Okay.

MR. BOVITZ: I noticed on the water and sewer fund that collections are a little under budget, but then the expenses are way under budget. Is there a reason why we're behind the City of Detroit water fee? I don't want to be on the news, not paying our water bill to Detroit.

1 MR. McCURLEY: No, sir. Usually that invoice comes in like one to two months behind by the time it hits, so, no 2 -- we're up to date, it's just a matter of the timing when 4 Wayne County submits the invoice. MR. BOVITZ: 5 So we're not like Joe Louis and Ford 6 Field then, right? 7 MR. McCURLEY: Not on that one, no. We're good. 8 MR. KORYZNO: Any further questions for Mr. 9 McCurley? 10 MS. PARKER: Just one other comment. 11 If Mr. O'Neal and Mr. McCurley, you sit down and 12 kind of review the budget and look at the five year budget, 13 perhaps Treasury could provide some technical assistance with the development of the five year budget. Just a thought. 14 15 MR. KORYZNO: Certainly. 16 MR. McCURLEY: Thank you. 17 MS. PARKER: Okay. 18 MR. KORYZNO: Thank you, Mr. McCurley. 19 entertain a motion. 20 MR. BOVITZ: So moved. 21 MS. PARKER: Support. 22 It's been moved and supported to MR. KORYZNO: 23 approve the monthly budget to actual report; any further 24 discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of the motion say aye. 25 MR. BOVITZ: Aye.

1	MS. PARKER: Aye.
2	MR. KORYZNO: Aye. Opposed, same sign. The monthly
3	to budget actual report is approved.
4	Item B3, approval of interim City Administrator
5	appointment. Mr. Van de Grift?
6	MR. VAN DE GRIFT: This resolution is from November
7	10th, and is outside the normal review period for this
8	meeting. However, because of the city's urgent need and
9	legal mandate to have an interim City Administrator, it is being
10	reviewed today.
11	The Board will recall Mr. O'Neal from his previous
12	service as interim City Administrator. I suppose any further
13	questions, you could direct to Mr. O'Neal.
14	MS. PARKER: I think he does look familiar.
15	MR. KORYZNO: Thank you. Any further discussion?
16	Seeing none, I'll entertain a motion.
17	MS. PARKER: So moved.
18	MR. BOVITZ: Support.
19	MR. KORYZNO: Moved and supported to approve
20	Resolution 404.14, City Administrator appointment from the
21	November 10, 2014 City Council meeting.
22	Any further discussion?
23	MR. BOVITZ: No.
24	MR. KORYZNO: Seeing none, all in favor of the
25	motion, say aye.

1	MR. KORYZNO: Aye.
2	MS. PARKER: Aye.
3	MR. KORYZNO: Aye. Opposed, same sign. The
4	resolution is approved.
5	Item B4, approval of interim City Administrator
6	contract.
7	MR. BOVITZ: Here's where I have a problem.
8	MR. KORYZNO: Mr. Van de Grift?
9	MR. VAN DE GRIFT: Very good. In a very sim in a
10	similar vein, this is the contract for Mr. O'Neal's services.
11	My understanding is, it is identical to the previous contract
12	that you had with the city.
13	MR. O'NEAL: There's a couple items in there, one
14	being cellphone
15	MR. KORYZNO: Approach the podium, please. And
16	identify yourself for the record.
17	MS. BOOMS: Okay, Cassandra Booms, legal department,
18	I guess, City Attorney's Department.
19	The contract is almost identical. I noticed I
20	didn't have a copy in my packet; I don't know if you have a
21	copy. I believe the salary is the same, the other issue, I
22	believe the salary is the same, which is \$3,461.64 which is
23	biweekly.
24	It's basically at will; the only benefits are the
25	\$60.00 stipend per month for a cellphone, and then, he had

the following paid city recognized holidays, which was in the 1 contract before. I think this time, though, the days are 2 just specified. And, the only other change was a little bit 3 of language, because the last time Mr. O'Neal was here, it 4 5 was just different circumstances, so we just changed some of the boilerplate up in the term. And that's -- that's it. 6 Any questions? MR. KORYZNO: Thank you. 7 MS. BOOMS: You're welcome. 8 MR. KORYZNO: I'll entertain a motion. 9 1.0 MR. BOVITZ: So moved. 11 MS. PARKER: Support. 12 It's been moved and supported to MR. KORYZNO: approve the interim City Manager contract as submitted. 13 14 Any further discussion? Seeing none, all in favor 1.5 of the motion say aye. 16 MR. BOVITZ: Aye. 17 MS. PARKER: Ave. Opposed, same sign. Motion is 18 MR. KORYZNO: Aye. 19 approved, and the City Manager's contract is approved. Item B5, approval of budget amendment 2015-3, Master 20 21 Plan funding, was addressed in new business. Item B6, approval of budget amendment 2015-4, 2.2 23 purchase for -- purchases for DPW, was addressed in new 2.4 business.

Item B7, approval of budget amendment 2015-5,

purchase of body cameras, was addressed in new business. 1 2 Item B8, release checks, this is information only 3 and no Board action is required. That brings us to Item C, 4 which is adoption of the 2015 RTAB meeting schedule. 5 MR. BOVITZ: The only conflict I had was April 14th; I'd really prefer to move that back a week, to April 21st, if 6 that's okay. 8 MR. KORYZNO: That's fine by me. 9 MS. PARKER: That's fine. 10 MR. BOVITZ: I'd like to go on vacation this year, 11 in April. 12 MR. KORYZNO: April 14 to 22? 13 MR. BOVITZ: 21st, please. 14 MR. KORYZNO: Twenty one, thank you. Any other 15 changes? Then I'll entertain a motion to adopt All right. the 2015 RTAB meeting schedule, with the proposed amendment. 16 17 MS. PARKER: So moved. 18 MR. BOVITZ: Support. MR. KORYZNO: Been moved and supported. Any further 19 20 discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of the motion say aye. 21 MR. BOVITZ: Aye. 22 MS. PARKER: Aye. 23 MR. KORYZNO: Aye. Opposed, same sign. The meeting 24 schedule for 2015 is adopted. Next item we have is public 25 comment. You'll have two minutes to speak. Mr. Van de Grift

is the timekeeper, and we have no one who is -- all right, we 1 . 2 have no public comment. Yes, Mr. --3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Would it be appropriate for me to 4 speak at this time? 5 MR. KORYZNO: Not if you haven't signed up. 6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okav. 7 MR. KORYZNO: Board comments? Any comments from the 8 Board? 9 MS. PARKER: Just a follow up question related to 10 the evaluation. Can you kind of, you or Mr. Van de Grift outline what the next step is, everything will go into the 11 12 Governor's office, and will the City receive a copy? 13 MR. VAN DE GRIFT: That's my understanding, is that 14 this would be a public document. 15 MS. PARKER: Okay. 16 MR. VAN DE GRIFT: But I would not make that decision, but I know that it will go to the Governor's 17 office, and then I would imagine that a copy would be 18 19 available for the City. 20 MR. BOVITZ: Well, this is all brand new; we're the 21 first city in the whole state to --22 MR. VAN DE GRIFT: We are the first in the state. 23 MS. PARKER: Yeah. 24 MR. VAN DE GRIFT: I would note that the Governor's 25 appointment letter notes that this annual review is for the

1. betterment of the City. I think a reasoned mind could assume 2 that the City would want to read it. 3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: That was my public comment. 4 would you get that? 5 MS. PARKER: Okay. 6 MR. KORYZNO: Sure. 7 MR. BOVITZ: Because we're all in the dark as far as 8 what's the next step? If the Governor's office will come back with any formal action, you know, we're just volunteers 9 on the Board here, at least I am. And so, I don't want this 10 11 to be a lifelong commitment, but I would like to see the City 12 of Ecorse be on its way. MS. PARKER: Right. 13 14 MR. KORYZNO: All right. 15 MR. VAN DE GRIFT: If I know more, I'll contact the 16 Board, but I think we're all just going to find our way, 17 We'll ship it off to the Governor's office, and see if 18 we hear back from the office. 19 So do we know, our term of office is at MR. BOVITZ: 20 the will of the Governor, so we are to be, to serve until 21 further notice, then? This is all untested, right? 22 MR. KORYZNO: Yeah. Right. Appointed until 23 otherwise. 24 MS. PARKER: Right. 25 MR. BOVITZ: I hope the City Council doesn't fire

1	us.
2	MR. KORYZNO: All right, any further Board comment?
3	Seeing none, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.
4	MR. BOVITZ: So moved.
5	MS. PARKER: Support.
6	MR. KORYZNO: Moved and supported, to adjourn the
7	meeting. All in favor say aye.
8	MR. BOVITZ: Aye.
9	MS. PARKER: Aye.
10	MR. KORYZNO: Aye. Opposed, same sign.
11	The Ecorse RTAB meeting is adjourned at 9:49 a.m.
12	Thank you.
13	(At 9:49 a.m. meeting concluded.)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	Respectfully submitted,
19	
20	Amy Shankleton-Novess
21	
22	Amy Shankleton-Novess
23	Certified Electronic Reporter November 24, 2014
24	
25	·